

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

GARVIN MITCHELL,

Case No.: 07 CIV 7608

(RJH)

:

- against -

Plaintiff,

GREATER REFUGE TEMPLE CHURCH a/k/a/: REFUGE TEMPLE CHURCH and a/k/a:

GREATER REFUGE TEMPLE and a/k/a THE : CHURCH OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST OF :

THE APOSTOLIC FAITH, INC.,

PROPOSED

SCHEDULING ORDER

Defendants.

Plaintiff, Garvin Mitchell and Defendant Greater Refuge Temple Church a/k/a/ Refuge
Temple Church and a/k/a Greater Refuge ("Greater Refuge") and a/k/a the Church of Our Lord
Jesus Christ of the Apostolic Faith, Inc. ("Church of Our Lord Jesus Christ") (collectively
"Defendants"), incorrectly sued here as a single defendant, by and through their respective
counsel, hereby submit this Proposed Scheduling Order pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil

Procedure 16(b) and 26(f):

1. Description of the Case

A. Parties and Counsel

Plaintiff: Garvin Mitchell

Plaintiff's Counsel: Marc A. Rapaport, Esq.

350 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4400 New York, New York 10118

(212) 382-1600

Defendant: Greater Refuge Temple Church a/k/a/ Refuge Temple Church and

a/k/a Greater Refuge ("Greater Refuge") and a/k/a the Church of Our Lord Jesus Christ of the Apostolic Faith, Inc. ("Church of Our

Lord Jesus Christ")

USDC SDNY
DOCUMENT
ELECTRONICALLY FILED
DOC #:
DATE FILED: 2 1908

Defendant's Counsel: Daniel F. Murphy, Jr. (Lead Attorney)

Mary Ellen Donnelly

Putney, Twombly, Hall & Hirson

521 Fifth Avenue

New York, New York 10175

(212) 682-0020

В. Jurisdictional Basis for the Litigation

Plaintiff alleges that he was subjected to disability discrimination in violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. §12101 et seq. (1994 and Supp. 1999) (the "ADA"). Based on the foregoing, Plaintiff asserts that this Court has federal question jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331.

Additionally, Plaintiff asserts that this Court has supplemental jurisdiction over his New York City Human Rights Law ("NYCHRL"), NYC Administrative Code §§8-502 and 8-107 et seq., claims; his New York State Human Rights Law Claim ("NYSHRL"), New York Executive Law §§292(1) and (5), claims; and his New York Minimum Wage Act ("MWA"), Labor Law Article 19§650, et seq., 12 N.Y.C.R.R.§§ 142-2.4, 142-3.4, claims, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1367.

C. Claims Asserted in the Complaint and Counterclaims, Case Issues & Relief Sought Plaintiff's Claim

Plaintiff alleges that he was terminated from Greater Refuge, in violation of the ADA, NYSHRL, and NYCHRL. Plaintiff additionally alleges that Defendant violated the ADA by failing to provide Plaintiff with reasonable accommodations based on his disability. Plaintiff also alleges that he worked shifts of greater than ten hours without receiving additional "spread-ofhours" compensation from Defendant in violation of the MWA.

Plaintiff's claim of damages include compensation and benefits he would have received but for his termination from the Defendant, monetary damages for emotional distress and mental anguish, amount of underpayments based on Defendant's failure to pay "spread-of-hours" compensation, and liquidated damages, as well as attorneys fees and costs of this action.

Defendant's Defenses

Defendant denies Plaintiff's claims in their entirety. Plaintiff cannot establish a prima facle case of discrimination which resulted in Plaintiff's termination of his employment on the basis of his disability. Plaintiff also cannot state a prima facie case of retaliation under the ADA. Plaintiff cannot demonstrate that Defendant discriminated against him based upon his disability in violation of the ADA, NYSHRL, or NYCHRL. Any and all actions taken by Defendant were based on legitimate, nondiscriminatory reasons unrelated to Plaintiff's purported disability and unrelated to any invocation by Plaintiff of rights arising under federal, state or local law.

As to Plaintiff's MWA claims, Defendant denies Plaintiff's claim that Defendant failed to pay "spread-of-hours" compensation in violation of MWA. Further, Plaintiff's claims are barred, in whole or in part, by the exclusivity provisions of the New York Workers' Compensation Law.

2. Proposed Case Management Plan

а. Pending Motions

There are no pending motions at this time

The Parties Propose the Following:

Ь. Deadline for joinder of additional parties: March 21, 2008

Ċ. Deadline for amendment of pleadings: March 21, 2008

d. Proposed schedule for completion of discovery:

> March 21, 2008 i. Rule 26(a)(1) disclosures:

ii. Fact Discovery: September 15, 2008

iii. Rule 26(a)(2) disclosures:

September 15, 2008

iv. Expert discovery completion date. including dates for delivery of expert reports

Dispositive motions e.

Any Motion for Summary Judgment will be filed on or before January 6, 2009.



f. Joint Pretrial Order

The Joint Pretrial Order will be filed by February 6, 2009, unless either party files a Motion for Summary Judgment, in which case the Joint Pretrial Order will be filed 60 days after the Court's ruling on any dispositive motion.

Trial schedule g.

- i. Plaintiff Requests a Trial by Jury
- ii. Length of Trial - The probable length of trial will be two weeks.
- iii. Trial Readiness - the case will be ready for trial 60 days after the filing of the Joint Trial Memorandum 04/06/09

3. Consent to Proceed Before a Magistrate Judge

Both Plaintiff and Defendant do not consent to proceed before a Magistrate Judge

4. Status of Settlement Discussions

There have been no settlement discussions.

5. a statu confere a shell be held on Sept. 19, dois at 10:00 ac.

Dated: New York, New York

February 4, 2008

Marc A. Rapaport, Esq. (MR 5775)

Empire State Building

350 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4400 New York, New York 10118

(212) 382-1600

Attorney for Plaintiff Garvin Mitchell

Deniel F. Murphy, Jr. (DM 9196)
PUTNEY, TWOMBLY, HALL & HIRSON

521 Fifth Avenue

New York, New York 10175

(212) 682-0020

Attorneys for Defendants

2/13/08